5. I think, only in two cases have I interfered with the Inspectors. I never instruct them to take cases or to leave them alone?—The officials of the unions have to take some fairly drastic steps before getting a case before the Court. The secretary has to call a meeting of the union by circular, get a resolution passed by a majority, and to adopt all the paraphernalia provided by the Act, and it costs money to do that. Under these circumstances, I think that where a union takes a case before the Court it ought to have the penalty which the judge gives. The men who conduct these cases have every justification for saying that they are likely to be spotted and victimised, and they have been for doing these things.

6. *The Chairman.*] Let me call your attention to a little discrepancy between your statement and Mr. Whiting's. Mr. Whiting says the union should get the expenses; you say it should get the penalty?—That is what I mean. We do not want to make anything out of the fine. That is not the intention when we take a case up.

7. The Magistrate has full power to give all costs against whoever goes before the Court?—I notice that. We agree with clauses 15 and 16, but do not see any connection between the two. Clause 18: When a Magistrate states a case for the Court of Arbitration we think it should be on the law-points only. If a question of law crops up we are not fit to deal with it, but on a question of fact we think the Magistrate should have power to deal with it. Section 19: We think no appeal ought to be allowed to the Supreme Court, and that the subclauses (1), (2), and (3) should be struck out. We are quite prepared to accept an award as it comes from the Magistrate. In clause 20 we want the first line struck out. This refers to the collection of the fine. In asking the employer to collect the fine you are condemning the man for ever in New Zealand, for a man in that position is on the black-list of every employer in the Dominion. I think we are right in saying such a man is not likely to get a job, and it is not fair to brand him through the Dominion because he has not paid his fine. When a man obtains credit from a tradesman and is sued before a Magistrate, and proves his inability to pay, he is not put in this position. If a man is not in a position to pay the fine in a case of breach, I think the Dominion can well afford to be put in the same position as the ordinary shopkeeper. As far as our union is concerned, we had one case where we applied for costs in the breaking of the award by a man and his employer. We had both of them up, and both were fined £5. The man has not finished paying up yet—he still ownes £1. The union has not taken any steps to recover the fine, but considers the man has been sufficiently degraded by being taken to Court for doing harm to his fellows, and consequently we have let him off. If the Government recovers the fines in the future as well as it has done in the past, it will be doing very well as compared with the ordinary tradesman. Up to the present it has done very well. In reference to Part III, "Conciliation," we say the whole of this ought to be struck out, and section 60 of the present Act—the "Willis blot"—repealed. Those of us who have followed the Arbitration Act from the beginning know that the employers have made a dead set at the Conciliation Boards, and refused to have anything to do with them. They have made a laughing-stock of them from the North Cape to the Bluff, and we think that would be obviated if the Boards were given power to make their recommendations binding until upset by the Court. There was a case told to me in which a Board's recommendations provided for a minimum wage of 1s. 3d. an hour, and one of the employers thought he had to pay it, and did pay it. One or two of the other employers however cited a case before the Court, and the amount was reduced to 1s. an hour. That goes to show that if a Board's recommendations were made binding, and had even the force of a Magistrate's decision, it would be a good thing for the country, and there would be nothing seriously to object to in it. In the bootmakers' case the Board gave a rise and we were not satisfied with it, but we got a reduction on the Board's finding. In all probability if the award had been binding the employers would not have gone on to the Court. We think if the Boards were given extended power they would really become Boards of Conciliation, and not, as now, be made the laughing-stock of the country. As far as the bootmakers are concerned, we have felt—I speak fearlessly and with full knowledge—little confidence in the Court of Arbitration, and do not dare to take a case before it. We have got a rise of 5s. a week and forty-five hours, but we got this from our industrial conference, composed of Mr. Arnold, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Whiting, and myself. We did not get all we wanted, but we got far more favourable conditions from the conference than from the Court of Arbitration. These industrial councils are generally held before going before the Board of Conciliation, and consist of men who belong to and represent the union. There are three from each side, without a chairman. If they come to no agreement, it is no use constituting them into an Industrial Council under the Bill and going through the whole rigmarole again. If they come to a decision it will be on the Magistrate's judgment, and we would prefer it to go before a chairman and four members as at present is the case with the Board, and if given this further power suggested the Conciliation Boards would do the duty intended. We wish all the clauses of Part III deleted, and the original Act amended by the repeal of clause 60. With reference to Part IV, "Miscellaneous," section 45 we agree with.

8. Are you quite sure? I called Mr. Whiting's attention to this?—We have both made the same mistake. We think the numbers are quite sufficient as they at present stand. With reference to the Minister's objection to small unions, I might say there are many branches of industry which would not get that consideration, if they were incorporated with another union, that they had a right to expect, through members of the other part of the industry not understanding their case. In the boot trade we have had to be very careful in reference to individual branches. We do not include all the branches, and it is desirable that these branches should get equal justice. If there are very few in these unions, as the Minister says, they would not be likely to get justice. I think there are very valid reasons for the retention of the provision that seven persons may form an industrial union. As Mr. Whiting said, if the Act were made retro-